

philanthropy, but with evil intent, intrude themselves upon him with a proposition designed and calculated to narrow his field of labor, and to mar his prospects of usefulness.

From the Syracuse Daily Star.

FATHER MATHEW AND THE ABOLITIONISTS.

GARRISON and BOWDITCH, two of the extreme and ultra Abolition leaders, called on Father Mathew, with a view we presume to secure his countenance and support to their measures, but in a long interview, they gained nothing but his testimony, as not being in favor of slavery. He was on another mission, and could not and would not identify himself with a matter, which he was evident he cared for but little, and was willing to leave in the hands of those who knew most about it. They left him a long letter in the hope of dragging something out of him, but he has not as yet replied.

There is no man at the North probably, who is not in truth an Abolitionist. We all desire the freedom of the slaves, but there are thousands of Christians, men who cannot coincide with extreme measures, or act in concert with persons who would burn every church in the land, and destroy every religious organization in existence. Father Mathew is a priest and a religious man, and was moved by these considerations, no doubt, to decline the invitation of Mr. Garrison.

From the N. Y. Journal of Commerce.

FATHER MATHEW AND THE ABOLITIONISTS.

An invitation was extended to Father Mathew by some of the leaders of the Abolitionists to attend an Emancipation Celebration. He wisely hesitated, as he foresaw that such a step would impair his usefulness throughout a large section of the Union, while engaged in his philanthropic mission, as the 'Apostle of Temperance.' Thereupon Garrison, of the Liberator, wrote on his own behalf the unoffending head of Father Mathew, and re-publishes a Circular signed by that gentleman several years ago, in common with 70,000 Irishmen, opposed to slavery. Thus, to gratify an evil passion, would these Abolitionists harrow up the embers of prejudice, and paralyze his exertions in behalf of suffering humanity throughout the Southern States.

From the Keene Sentinel.

In Mr. Charles Sumner's letter apologizing for being unable to attend an anti-slavery meeting in the Western Reserve, he welcomes the honest, earnest men of all parties and all places in the cause. Welcome to the efforts of Benton in Missouri, and Clay in Kentucky! This is in much better taste than the venomous language of Mr. Garrison, at Worcester, on the occasion of celebrating the anniversary of West India emancipation. The time was changed from the 1st to the 3rd, to throw contempt upon the President's and the Governor's Proclamations. For the Fast. Mr. G., who presided, read these proclamations, and then proceeded to read the President of the U. S. a 'corrupt human scoundrel,' and 'Geo. N. Briggs (the Governor of the State), another of the conspirators against human liberty.' Wendell Phillips and Theodore Parker mended nothing. Stephen Foster, the tolerated, should have been present to wind up. The celebration of West India emancipation, scarcely referred to, was rather an occasion for disposing of plethoric accumulations. Though specially waited on and urged, Father Mathew very properly declined identifying himself with this or any other political movement.

Selections.

From Frederick Douglass's North Star.

FATHER MATHEW AND SLAVERY.

Nothing reveals more completely and mournfully the all-prevailing presence and power of the spirit of slavery in this land than the fact, that a foreigner that ventures on our soil is found able to withstand its pernicious and seductive influence. Man after man has appeared in our midst, from whom, in view of his previous history, we had reason to expect a bold and uncompromising stand against this giant wrong, and then, in the face of the cause, and in the presence of the people, he has been found ready to bow down before the idol of slavery. Many names might be mentioned—especially those of divines—from England, Ireland and Scotland, known and distinguished at home as the friends of the anti-slavery cause, who have, almost immediately on landing, deserted their principles, abandoned the cause, and linked themselves with the oppressors and haters of liberty, finding it much easier to sail with the popular breeze, than to maintain their integrity. It would seem that the foul demon stands ready, upon all our borders, to seduce or overwhelm every man who comes within its reach.

From our acquaintance with Father Mathew, we had fondly hoped that his would be a better fate; that he would not change his morality by changing his locality; but that he would nobly avow, and stand fast by, the principles he professed to cherish in his own land. We are, however, grieved, humbled and mortified, to find that he has done the very reverse of this. He has forsaken the cause of the oppressed, by pledging himself to the oppressor that he will remain dumb on the subject of slavery during his sojourn in this country. A more melancholy spectacle cannot be imagined; and though most painful to us, we should be false to our high obligations to liberty, did we not expose this disgraceful apostasy.

In the year 1842, Theobald Mathew signed an address from the people of Ireland to their countrymen and countrywomen in America, calling their attention to the subject of American slavery, denouncing the system, and declaring that the land of America never could be glorious so long as its soil is polluted by the footsteps of a single slave; affirming slavery to be the most tremendous invasion of the natural, inalienable rights of man, and of some of the noblest gifts of God; and, 'What a spectacle does America present to the eyes of the world—a land of profane Christian blasphemy, and of the energies for the oppression and degradation of three millions of innocent human beings, the children of one common Father, who suffer the most grievous wrongs and the utmost degradation for no crime of their own, and for no crime of theirs, but for a sin against God and man. All who are not for it must be against it; none can be neutral. We entreat you to take the side of justice, religion and liberty. We call upon you to unite with the abolitionists.'

Such was Father Mathew's advice to his countrymen in America, when he stood under the shade of the British monarchy; but oh! how different, how changed is his time, when he treads the soil of this Republic! Within a few days, a train of circumstances has compelled him to define his position; and, as if he had sought to find for himself a refuge, of which, seven years since, he denied the existence, 'None can be neutral,' he then said; upon this, his mind has undergone a change. He now thinks he has found neutral ground. The circumstances leading to this development are briefly these:

[Here follows the account of the interview of the Committee with Father Mathew, from the Liberator.]

Such seems to be the present position of Father Mathew; and it is one of which, we have no doubt, his countrymen at home will be heartily ashamed. It is needless for us to expose the sophistry by which Father Mathew seeks to defend his position. The case which he puts, of being a Catholic priest in the last which he should have taken to illustrate the relation he shall maintain to the anti-slavery cause in this country. He was a Catholic priest in Ireland, and a temperance man in Ireland; and though pressed on all sides with engagements, he found time to express himself clearly in behalf of the anti-slavery cause; and it is not to be believed that what he then said against American slavery in any degree lessened his power against the slavery of temperance. His assumed unwillingness to 'turn aside' from the temperance cause to promote Catholicism, would wear the appearance of impartiality, if the cases were alike—which they are not. Every one knows Father Mathew to be a Roman Catholic; every one does not know him to be an Abolitionist. On the one question he is openly committed, and is willing to stand committed; on the other, he is entirely opposed to committing himself. He has no occasion to 'turn aside' to promote Catholicism. He does not promote it, and cannot help promoting it. In every good word that he speaks, and in every good deed that he performs, he promotes the cause of Roman Catholicism, which is openly identified with that system of religion. But it is not so on the subject

of slavery. The anti-slavery cause derives no influence in its favor from a man who declares himself unwilling to 'commit himself' in its behalf. The reader must remember that our Boston friends made no exorbitant or unreasonable demand upon Father Mathew's time. They assured him of their unwillingness to divert him from the great purpose of his mission to this country, and they simply wished him to attend this celebration as an appropriate opportunity in which to make known his sympathy with the cause of the oppressed. The length of time required for this could not have exceeded one day, so that, on this score, Father Mathew is without excuse.

It is obvious to common sense, that the policy of Father Mathew will fail in its object. Thank God that it is within the power of the anti-slavery press of the country (feeble as it is) to make his treachery to liberty known throughout the land; and although he may luxuriate for awhile in the smiles of American Abolitionists, and eat the bread wrung out from the sweat and blood of the bondman, the time will come when his treachery must recoil upon him. God will 'confound the wisdom of the crafty,' and 'bring to nought the counsels of the ungodly.' But we will not be too severe. We hope that Father Mathew, in yet his later years, will confess his error, and identify himself with the cause of the long degraded and deeply injured bondman, before he leaves this country. F. D.

From the Pennsylvania Freeman.

FATHER MATHEW.

With pain and regret we have read the account, which we give from the Liberator, of the interview of Father Mathew with the committee of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society; and such must be the emotions of every impartial and conscientious man of man at its perusal. We had hoped that the man who had so nobly devoted himself to an unpopular and humane reform in Ireland, who had there publicly and repeatedly manifested a warm interest in the Anti-Slavery Cause in America, and had welcomed advocates to his house, who had joined with Daniel O'Connell, and 70,000 other Irishmen, in urging the Irish in America to identify themselves with the Abolitionists; we had hoped that he would be able to stand against the seductions and the power of slavery in our country, unlike the many time-serving British preachers, who had betrayed or deserted the cause of Freedom on our shores. We are disappointed. We have no wish that Father Mathew should leave his own peculiar work to labor in our cause, but no philanthropist, (may we not say, no man?) has a right to withhold his sympathy and God-speed from the cause of the slave, and the expression of his abhorrence of slavery, and no confession of his inability to do so. He could as well look with indifference upon robbery and murder, or refuse a word of cheer to the life-battle men struggling through peril to save a shipwrecked crew.

The Bulletin replies with more violence of tone and rudeness of manner than force of argument, to Mr. Garrison's calm and candid article, entirely misapprehending its spirit, and misrepresenting its sentiments, and indulging very largely in the faults charged upon Mr. G. We shall notice this reply again.

From the National A. S. Standard.

FATHER MATHEW—THE IRISH ADDRESS.

The Irish Address is now at the Anti-Slavery office in Boston, and is copied by the Liberator. It is a document of no small importance, and one of that paper to a perfect understanding of the position in which Father Mathew has placed himself. We do not see how the Committee of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society could, with this address before them, do less than invite the Rev. Father to attend the Festival at Worcester. Words have been expressed a deeper abhorrence of slavery, and a more ardent desire to see it abolished, than in any other address of American slavery than he declared in '42 was felt by him; the terms he made use of to convey his sense of the duty of Irishmen in America on this great question, and the exhortations he used to urge them to identify themselves with the cause of the slave and its friends, are certainly as strong as any that could be made there. The Committee had no right to assume Father Mathew to be a hypocrite; to suppose that one who had exhorted his countrymen to 'love Liberty, late Slavery, and cling to the Abolitionists,' would not most joyfully find the first opportunity to offer to prove how much he had in earnest in uttering such earnest words, would have been an imputation of the common honesty of the distinguished visitor, which those gentlemen would not have dared to make. We can conceive of no concatenation of circumstances which would have justified them in withholding such an attention from him. Not only was it demanded by the words, but to have neglected it would have been an insult of the grossest character. To invite him to Worcester was simply saying—'Sir, you have exhorted all Irishmen in America, by the memory of their country, by their duty to their fellow-creatures, by their obligations to the Almighty, to do this cause, and you will, we are sure, be glad of an opportunity to second these words by acts. We neglected to invite him would have been to say, 'Reverend Priest, we believe you to be hypocrite, a liar, and a coward. Through us, you have exhorted your countrymen to do what you could not do yourself; you have called on them to be faithful to a cause which you mean to desert; have bid them not to yield to a temptation which you have not the strength to withstand; to avoid a miserable and contemptible weakness which you have not the courage to resist; in short, by every thing that is most precious, sacred and dear to the soul and heart of man, you have commanded as a priest, and besought as a brother, that they would not forget or neglect a duty which you fling from you with contempt the moment you are placed in their circumstances. We will not dishonor our cause by appealing to abolitionists to do what you have not done, and we will not be here what we pretended to be at home. All this the Committee could not say, or seem to say; but having these words of Father Mathew before them, they could only believe them the honest utterances of a true-hearted man, and act accordingly. It was not their wish to draw him away from the cause to which he had nobly devoted himself, or to do him a single injustice in his path. It was his own honor which was to be vindicated, not their benefit which was to be sought. It is to be sincerely regretted that in this matter, at least, the Apostle of Temperance should have taken for his model that Apostle who to the world said, 'This man was also with him,' replied, 'Woman, I know him now.'

That the reverend Father has put himself in a very 'tight place' is not to be gainsaid, and all the efforts of his friends to get him out will be blessed with very small success, if they follow the bad example set them by the Albany Evening Journal. A man who travels a great way, and who has put his boots; but she is sure to undertake it at last; and in this case, moreover, it is unfortunate that Truth got the start on the journey, for the actual facts in regard to the invitation to the Worcester Festival, the interview of Messrs. Garrison and Bowditch with Father Mathew, and his reply to them, have already been widely published. The character of the transaction is too well understood now to permit of this false, garbled, and malicious account of it to do much mischief. To assert that the intent of the anti-slavery committee was 'evil,'—that they wished to ensnare Mr. Mathew in an 'entangling alliance,'—that they 'meant to strike a fatal blow to his usefulness in the Southern States,'—is simply a vile and base slander, uttered in that spirit, the indulgence of which has, occasionally, if we remember aright, subjected Thro' Weed to the merited smart of a well used horse-whip in the hands of some unfortunate victim of his malevolence, and caused him to act more than once as defendant in our courts of law; and the representation of the manner in which the invitation was presented, and of its reception by Father Mathew,—the insinuation that the Irish address was a mere 'circumlocution,' not worth remembering, the fact carefully concealed that it was addressed to the whole body of Irish in this country, and clothed in the most intense and emphatic language,—and the keeping out of sight that Father Mathew, in reply to Mr. Garrison, not only showed himself to be not man enough to do as he had exhorted others to do, and assert his right to join in a commemoration of a great signal triumph achieved by his own countrymen, of the religion of which he professes to be set apart as a minister, but one capable of denying the very principles, which a few years before he had declared to be the basis of his mission, and which he had solemnly pledged himself to maintain in his own countrymen, on all the moral questions that now agitate the public mind.

We hope, at the close of his mission in this country, Father Mathew, with all the facts before him, and with a better appreciation of the state of things in this country, will leave some parting advice to his countrymen, on all the moral questions that now agitate the public mind.

How far Father Mathew's chance of success in the Temperance cause, in this country, may have been lessened by this unfortunate act of his, we cannot say, but this at least we are sure of,—if lessened at all, he has nobody to thank but himself. Our Boston friends, with the best motives, adopted the natural and almost only possible course for them to pursue as men desirous of showing all proper solicitude to the distinguished stranger, and it certainly is no fault of theirs if he should have involved himself in difficulty, because he denies being here what he assumed to be at home.

From the Practical Christian.

THE WORCESTER CELEBRATION.

Father Mathew neither attended nor excused himself by letter. It appears from credible testimony, given on the occasion, that this distinguished Irishman, though a great Abolitionist three thousand miles off, in old Ireland, ignores the whole anti-slavery agitation here in this land of slaveholders. He expects to go among them and be their guest, as the apostle of teetotalism, and a genuine Catholic priest. His conduct in this matter reveals such a want of uncompromising moral principle, such a want of narrowness of philanthropic feeling, and such calculating servility to the pro-slavery of the land, that true-hearted Abolitionists must turn away from him with sorrowful disgust. Happily they are veteran teetotalers, and do not need either his pledge, medal or benediction. And as to his poverty, most of them do not need that. For our own part, we should despise anyone who could be caught doing homage, either in public or private, even to the temperance pre-eminence of such a man. To be sure, he was under no special obligation to go to the Worcester meeting; but he was under the most sacred moral obligations to declare the same honest and candid article, entirely misapprehending its spirit, and misrepresenting its sentiments, and indulging very largely in the faults charged upon Mr. G. We shall notice this reply again.

Just as we had written to this point, the Chronicle of the 15th came to hand, with an elaborate leader panegyrizing Father Mathew's conduct, and denouncing Garrison as a man who does not care the value of a copper cent for the cause of Freedom or Temperance. For our own part, we should despise anyone who could be caught doing homage, either in public or private, even to the temperance pre-eminence of such a man. To be sure, he was under no special obligation to go to the Worcester meeting; but he was under the most sacred moral obligations to declare the same honest and candid article, entirely misapprehending its spirit, and misrepresenting its sentiments, and indulging very largely in the faults charged upon Mr. G. We shall notice this reply again.

From the New Bedford Weekly Echo.

FATHER MATHEW AND MR. GARRISON.

We beg our friends to read carefully and thoroughly the article in another column, headed 'Interview with Father Mathew,' in connection with the Address with his signature on the first page. They will of course draw their own conclusions, either regarding him as a man of principle, or as a man of compromise. We have nothing more to say of this article at present than that, in relation to both parties, it is the most reptile-like of any thing we ever read in the Chronicle.

We beg our friends to read carefully and thoroughly the article in another column, headed 'Interview with Father Mathew,' in connection with the Address with his signature on the first page. They will of course draw their own conclusions, either regarding him as a man of principle, or as a man of compromise. We have nothing more to say of this article at present than that, in relation to both parties, it is the most reptile-like of any thing we ever read in the Chronicle.

From the New England Washingtonian.

FATHER MATHEW AND MR. GARRISON.

Mr. Garrison, in last week's Liberator, makes some statements with regard to his interview with Father Mathew, that do to that great man injustice. We were present at the interview, and since Mr. Garrison has seen fit to publish what we supposed was a private conversation, we feel no delicacy in giving our own impressions.

On the morning Mr. Garrison called, a large number of our friends were present. How our expectations, which requested Father Mathew to visit their neighborhoods. These requests embarrassed him, as he did not expect them to be in Boston more than a fortnight. The parties pressed their requests with some zeal, and he, of course, was unable to give them any engagement.

We published below the material part of Mr. G's statement, and have our own comments. We did not perceive that Father Mathew was more embarrassed in the above interview, than he had been in any previous one of the morning, and consequently so much of Mr. G's statement as alluded to this interview, we must consider as a mere report, bearing, as tending to show that Father Mathew was embarrassed by an interview with abolitionists.

The next variation that strikes Mr. White is, respecting the connection in which I reported Father Mathew to have said that 'he did not know as we could say that there are any special injunctions of Scripture against slavery.' Mr. White thinks that he made the declaration in another place, and put it as an excuse into the mouth of Southern slaveholding Catholic priests!—Father Mathew replied, that probably it was because they did not believe there were any special injunctions of Scripture against it, but we will not quarrel with such a supposition.

The next statement is, that Mr. G. said that Father Mathew's signing the address, and that he seemed to recall the fact with difficulty; whereas our own impression is, though of this we are not positive, that Father Mathew alluded to it first, using the following expression, 'Sure didn't I sign the address?'

The last charge is, that Father Mathew did not before the meeting at Worcester, and has not since, answered the letter put into his hands. The reasons why he did not, would be obvious to most persons, that having a personal interview with the parties, he did not feel bound to answer the communication. We have some knowledge of the question, and know that during the first ten days he was here, he had not a moment that he could call his own. His health was still feeble, and he was unable to attend to all the people that called upon him, much less to attend to all the communications that poured in upon him.

We regret, with Mr. Garrison, that Father Mathew is not able to give his time to some of the other philanthropic movements in which the public are interested, but we cannot complain when we know that his rule is imperative to give his whole time up to the temperance cause. When he came here, he intended to stay a year, but that he was obliged to leave, would consume more than that time, and under these circumstances he made the decision at starting. He will not attend repeat meetings, a matter very interesting to him, on the same ground.

We need not wonder at this decision, and Mr. G. is the last person who ought to complain. Mr. Garrison published the first total abstinence paper in the world; and yet, who hears of him now in our temperance meetings? Another evil seemed greater, and he devoted himself to it. Father Mathew has seen his own countrymen enslaved, and degraded through intemperance, and who shall blame him for giving his undivided attention to their emancipation from this curse? The only thing that Mr. Garrison or any one else can ask, is that Father Mathew should in any way encourage the slave power, by taking back anything he has said.

The Liberator.

BOSTON, AUGUST 24, 1849.

No Union with Slaveholders!

THE INTERVIEW.

In giving my account of the interview of the Anti-Slavery Committee with Father Mathew, I stated that we were introduced to him by our friend WILLIAM A. WHITE, Esq., of Watertown, the editor of the New England Washingtonian. In the preceding column is his account of that interview, in which he attempts to correct my report of it in a few particulars. I am extremely sorry to see an effort like this, on the part of a professed abolitionist, to whitewash the inexcusable conduct of Father Mathew on that occasion.

Among the lamentable consequences that are sure to result from a case of apostasy so glaring, on the part of an individual so distinguished and popular, one is the pernicious influence exerted upon minds disposed to waver and almost induce the recalcitrant to duty—minds of a superficial and compromising character as to any great reform—causing them to yield somewhat of principle, in order to shield the object of their admiration from censure. Thousands of such minds will be depraved, more or less, in regard to anti-slavery and temperance, by the inexcusable conduct of Father Mathew; for he must be shielded from blame, at whatever sacrifice of truth or honesty, let what will become of the cause of humanity. Hence, they will make for him the most ridiculous excuses, and suggest the most contradictory reasons, why he is justified in acting the part of a 'dumb dog,' instead of opening his mouth 'in the cause of all such as are appointed to destruction,' according to the dictates of nature and the command of God.

Let us look at the statement of Mr. White, and see whether it is of any value—whether it helps Father Mathew one jot or tittle—and, especially, whether it indicates an anti-slavery or a mere partisan spirit. Before doing so, let this be borne in mind, that very soon after the introduction, Mr. White retired to the back part of the room, (a spacious one,) for the singular reason, as he states privately, that he felt delicate about remaining, and thus placed himself in a position by no means favorable to a correct hearing and understanding of the conversation.

His first point is, that Father Mathew was not, in his opinion, more embarrassed at the interview with us than he had been all the morning by the numerous temperance applications that had poured in upon him. Be it so; or saw that he was embarrassed, for some cause or other, and so stated the fact. Mr. White says it was the numerous temperance requests which had been made to him, that morning, that produced this embarrassment! It may be so; but if these had such an effect upon him, in his own chosen field of labor, is it uncharitable to suppose, or to assume, that his embarrassment was somewhat deepened by the presentation of a request to him, touching a subject not every where lauded like that of temperance, but treated as vulgar and fanatical throughout the length and breadth of the land—even by the host of his own flatterers? What think you, reader?

We should like to know how many individuals and deputations preceded us that morning. We called at 8 o'clock to see Father Mathew, supposing the hour to be so early as to find him not particularly engaged; and after waiting a few minutes, were introduced to him, seeing no other persons except the Rev. Lyman Beecher and his son Edward, who went before us, and occupied only a few moments of his time. Is not a mole-hill magnified unreasonably to monstrous dimensions by Mr. White, in order to account for the embarrassment of Father Mathew not as affected by our anti-slavery presentation?

Who does not see, that to be totally perplexed as to deciding upon applications which are perfectly agreeable, is one thing; and that to be disturbed by an urgent request, respecting the public espousal of a hated cause, is a very different thing? The former is only a difficulty as to time; the latter indicates an uneasiness of mind as to the thing desired—and that uneasiness I am sure was evinced by Father Mathew, as soon as the object of our visit was stated. If his mind was not in a state of complete moral confusion, why did he at once resort to the old pro-slavery declarations—'I am not in favor of slavery.' I should not think of advocating slavery! Does an abolitionist ever talk in this manner? Is it not sure evidence, at least on American soil, that he who makes such protestations is a compromiser and a twaddler? Why protest before being accused? It was because we knew that he had denounced American slavery, root and branch, in Ireland, that we called upon him in good faith, being justified in supposing that we should find him an outspoken abolitionist.

The next variation that strikes Mr. White is, respecting the connection in which I reported Father Mathew to have said that 'he did not know as we could say that there are any special injunctions of Scripture against slavery.' Mr. White thinks that he made the declaration in another place, and put it as an excuse into the mouth of Southern slaveholding Catholic priests!—Father Mathew replied, that probably it was because they did not believe there were any special injunctions of Scripture against it, but we will not quarrel with such a supposition.

The next statement is, that Mr. G. said that Father Mathew's signing the address, and that he seemed to recall the fact with difficulty; whereas our own impression is, though of this we are not positive, that Father Mathew alluded to it first, using the following expression, 'Sure didn't I sign the address?'

The last charge is, that Father Mathew did not before the meeting at Worcester, and has not since, answered the letter put into his hands. The reasons why he did not, would be obvious to most persons, that having a personal interview with the parties, he did not feel bound to answer the communication. We have some knowledge of the question, and know that during the first ten days he was here, he had not a moment that he could call his own. His health was still feeble, and he was unable to attend to all the people that called upon him, much less to attend to all the communications that poured in upon him.

We regret, with Mr. Garrison, that Father Mathew is not able to give his time to some of the other philanthropic movements in which the public are interested, but we cannot complain when we know that his rule is imperative to give his whole time up to the temperance cause. When he came here, he intended to stay a year, but that he was obliged to leave, would consume more than that time, and under these circumstances he made the decision at starting. He will not attend repeat meetings, a matter very interesting to him, on the same ground.

We need not wonder at this decision, and Mr. G. is the last person who ought to complain. Mr. Garrison published the first total abstinence paper in the world; and yet, who hears of him now in our temperance meetings? Another evil seemed greater, and he devoted himself to it. Father Mathew has seen his own countrymen enslaved, and degraded through intemperance, and who shall blame him for giving his undivided attention to their emancipation from this curse? The only thing that Mr. Garrison or any one else can ask, is that Father Mathew should in any way encourage the slave power, by taking back anything he has said.

We hope, at the close of his mission in this country, Father Mathew, with all the facts before him, and with a better appreciation of the state of things in this country, will leave some parting advice to his countrymen, on all the moral questions that now agitate the public mind.

As to the hope expressed, that Father Mathew will be his blunderbuss at slavery when retreating?—I am not at all sanguine.

THE TOUCH OF THE ITHURIEL SPEAR OF ANTI-SLAVERY MOST EFFECTUAL.

Ever since the abolition of British West India slavery, the anniversary of that glorious event has been celebrated in this Commonwealth by the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, on which occasion it has been usual to invite persons friendly to the cause of emancipation, though not connected with the Society, to participate in the proceedings—the event itself being deemed one in which all could rejoice together. What could be more courteous or magnanimous? No one has ever thought of treating the invitation disdainfully; no outcry has ever been made against the Society on that account; where the persons invited could make it convenient to attend, they have done so—and where they could not, they have sent kind and gentlemanly replies, explaining the cause of their absence.

In accordance with this usage, a short time prior to the late anniversary, epistolary invitations were addressed to them, in behalf of the occasion, to the Hon. JOHN G. PALFREY, CHARLES SUMNER, Esq., and FATHER MATHEW—to the first two gentlemen, on account of their well-known interest in the anti-slavery cause—to the last gentleman, in token of the esteem that was felt for his character and labors as a philanthropist, in remembrance of the fact of his having signed an anti-slavery address to his countrymen in America a few years since, in consideration that he was the most unexceptionable one that he could attend on the American soil, and in the hope and expectation that, if he could not give his bodily presence, he would at least express in his reply the feelings of a man, the sympathies of a philanthropist, and the emotions of an Irish abolitionist.

Messrs. PALFREY and SUMNER replied promptly and very kindly to the letters addressed to them, but Father Mathew, up to this hour, has returned no answer to his letter of invitation—a letter, as any one may see, who will take the trouble to read it, couched in as respectful, kind and unexceptionable language as it is possible to address to a human being.

Now, for the simple act of extending to him this courteous invitation, see by the articles on the first column how much of personal malice and envy have been developed, what venom and filth have been ejected, what ribaldry and falsehood resorted to, how anti-slavery apostasy and pro-slavery villany have mingled harmoniously together, and how many evils of wrath have been poured out, especially on our naked head!

For the accommodation of those who may not have the time or patience to read the abusive articles we have grouped together, we read from them the following as their sum and substance:—

Boston Chronicle.—'A certain clique of abolitionists'—Garrison is stone blind on the inside.—'He can hardly see any thing this side of the slave States'—'We don't believe he cares the value of a copper cent for the cause of Freedom or Temperance'—'So he undertakes, with all his might and cunning'—'It is a little too bad for so great a man as William Lloyd Garrison to uphold so little a man as Theobald Mathew'—'Let such a would-be Pope'—'He insults Father Mathew'—'The whole act is his, and not that of Jackson, Wendell Phillips, or Dr. Bowditch'—'The indignity to ask the good father'—'More palpable dogmatism never thundered through the Latin of the Vatican'—'Not so pointed a rebuff as such impudence demanded'—'Garrison British Emancipation and Anti-Slavery Celebration'—&c. &c.

Boston Herald.—'Shameful attempt of the Boston abolitionists'—the old Garrison abolition squad'—'a senseless, concocted, insane fiction'—'not sense enough to let slavery alone, that it may die of itself'—'Lloyd Garrison has had the audacity to visit Father Mathew'—'The shameless effrontery displayed by Garrison on this occasion'—'An oily, smooth-tongued hypocrite'—'Father Mathew is doing more for the country than any abolitionist that ever lived'—&c. &c.

Lynn Pioneer.—'Anti-Slavery Disunionists'—'Father Mathew taken to do for inconsistency by Wm. L. Garrison and James N. Buffum'—'We can conceive of many reasons, any one of which would have justified, not only, but demanded, Father Mathew's declination'—&c. &c.

Boston Daily Advertiser.—'Mischievous making'—'An attempt to injure the position of Father Mathew, and to break down his influence'—'He has the appearance of intentional mischief'—&c. &c.

Catholic Observer.—'Garrison's brain can contain but one idea'—'His blasphemous denunciations of that which is held sacred'—'The blasphemy of God and all holy things'—'who is not only a traitor to God, but also to his country, which in his mad fury he would deliver over to anarchy, confusion, and civil strife'—'The Garrisonian tribe, who are the enemies of society and of God'—&c. &c.

Boston Daily Times.—'Mr. Garrison is ruled by one dominant idea, to realize which, he would not hesitate to destroy the whole human race'—'He is himself the very slave of his own breath'—'The man in history whom he most resembles is Robespierre'—'The den of a raging tiger would be an agreeable place, compared with a state ruled by him and his ultra supporters'—'His egotism is vast and insatiable'—'He is considered to be but little different from a lunatic at home'—'The delicious odor of rotten eggs he can inhale only by a vigorous effort of memory'—&c. &c.

Boston Daily Transcript.—'Mr. Garrison figures as the Mayan Apollo'—'I have seen nothing so abominably hoarse as Mr. Garrison himself, when thoroughly drunk with abolition'—'Nobody but a madman or a fool'—'These judicious gentlemen propose to identify him [Father Mathew] with William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, and Abby Folsom'—'It is well if the abolitionists are teetotalers, (else) it would soon be necessary to multiply our retreats for the insane'—'Mr. Wendell Phillips, in one of his recent delirious eruptions of fire and smoke'—'The modern (anti-slavery) associations somewhat resemble those conventions of madmen and fools, denominated in 1721, "Hell Fire Clubs"'—&c. &c.

New York Morning Star.—'A most diabolical plot to cut short the useful mission of Father Mathew'—'Garrison, burning with hatred and revenge'—'We are glad to see Father Mathew reject the advances of the abolitionists; no friend of this country can ever countenance them'—&c. &c.

Yarmouth Register.—'The propensity of certain would-be philanthropists in the North to make mischief on all occasions'—'The great Mr. Wm. Lloyd Garrison and his coadjutors'—'A few crazy abolitionists in Boston'—'Every one who does not rant and rant as certain mad-caps in Boston'—'Garrison and his clique'—'Denounce in elegant billingsgate the clergy, the clergy, &c.'—'The Boston Liberator, the organ of the ultra abolitionists, disunionists, and no-government men'—&c. &c.

Albany Evening Journal.—'The fanatic call upon Father Mathew'—'This atrocious, this infernal outrage, is perpetrated by the professed friends of temperance'—'Lloyd Garrison and Wendell Phillips, in the garb of philanthropy, but with evil intent, intrude themselves upon him'—&c. &c.

What absence of all personal malice, what sacred regard for truth, what candor and magnanimity, what sympathy for the imbruted slave, what attachment to the cause of liberty, what deep concern for the honor of the country, what lively and unfeigned interest in the success of Father Mathew's mission, have we here! Who can for a moment doubt the disinterestedness and integrity, the lofty patriotism and Christian devotedness of such backers?

WENDELL PHILLIPS TO JAMES HAUGH-TON OF DUBLIN.

Boston, August 20th, 1849.

DEAR SIR—You will have heard, before this reaches you, of Father Mathew's decision to be absent, while in this country, on the subject of slavery. The Abolitionists have learned it with deep regret. Being all of us, with hardly an exception, teetotalers, minutely acquainted with and deeply interested in Father Mathew's labors, grateful for the noble protest he sent here against slavery in 1842, and for the welcome he has given to American Abolitionists abroad—

